



Express Mail No. EV758926698US

Attorney Docket No. 249768014US

**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

IN RE APPLICATION OF: JEFFREY P. BEZOS *ET AL.*

APPLICATION NO.: 09/437,815

FILED: NOVEMBER 10, 1999

FOR: **METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR  
ALLOCATING DISPLAY SPACE**

EXAMINER: JEFFREY D. CARLSON  
ART UNIT: 3622  
CONF. NO: 8505

**Reply Brief Under 37 C.F.R. § 41.41**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Reply Brief responds to the Examiner's Answer mailed on December 29, 2005 in the above-identified application.

**I. Introduction**

Applicants wish to reply to comments in the Examiner's Answer. The Examiner makes several fundamental mistakes in interpreting Roth. First, Roth's "bid selection logic" does not change bids as the Examiner suggests. Second, Roth does not describe the changing of a "proposed bid" as the Examiner also suggests. More fundamentally, Roth does not change any bids, proposed or actual. Roth does describe that "the bid amount will be increased as need [sic] to maintain the desired level of buying." However, this is not changing any bids. Rather, Roth is simply stating that a bidding agent will submit high bids so that more advertisements are placed. The bidding agent does not change any bid—it simply establishes a bid to be submitted. There is no "system-increase of a low proposed bid" as the Examiner suggests. Because of these misinterpretations, the Examiner's conclusions as to anticipation and obviousness are wrong.